DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 215 700 IR 010 194

AUTHOR Younger, Jennifer; And Others
TITLE Subject Headings for Individual Works of Art, Architecture, and Analogous Artifacts and Structures. A Final Report.
INSTITUTION American Library Association, Chicago, Ill. Resources and Technical Services Div.
PUB DATE 1 Feb 81
NOTE 22p.; Report prepared by the Subcommittee on Subject Headings for Individual Works of Art, Architecture, and Analogous Artifacts and Structures and submitted to the Cataloging and Classification Section of the Resources and Technical Services Division of the American Library Association.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Architecture; *Art; *Cataloging; Guidelines; *Indexing; Library Catalogs; *Subject Index Terms

ABSTRACT

Prepared to identify problem areas and to present cataloging principles in accordance with basic subject and name entry theory and practice, this final subcommittee report makes five recommendations to the Resources and Technical Services Division of the American Library Association for changes in current practices in subject cataloging of individual works of art, architecture, and related materials. These are (1) the assignment of a subject heading for the artist, when known, for all works of art and public monuments, further subdivided by "--individual works"; (2) the assignment of a subject heading for the architect, engineer, landscape architect, or other creator when known, further subdivided by "--Individual works"; (3) omission of the name of the individual art work, whether anonymous or by a known artist, from the subject heading; (4) the establishment of all subject headings for the names of buildings, gardens, monuments, bridges, parks, playgrounds, plazas, and streets according to the second edition of the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules; and (5) the use of multiple access points. Patterns and examples of subject headings are provided. (RAA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED215700

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

IR

Subject Headings for Individual Works of Art, Architecture and Analogous Artifacts and Structures, a final report

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Jennifer Younger

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

by the

Subcommittee on Subject Headings for Individual Works of Art, Architecture and Analogous Artifacts and Structures

submitted to the Subject Analysis Committee,
Cataloging and Classification Section,
Resources and Technical Services Division,
American Library Association
on Feb. 1, 1981

chairperson: Jennifer Younger, principal cataloger, Memorial Library, University of Wisconsin-Madison

members: Donald Anderle, chief, Art and Architecture Division, New York Public Library;
Peter Lisbon, chief subject cataloger, Widener Library, Harvard University;
Karen Muller, head, Technical Services, Ryerson and Burnham Libraries, the Art Institute of Chicago;
Al Cohen, head, Cataloging Dept., University of California, Santa Barbara

consultants: Bethany Mendenhall, associate librarian, J. Paul Getty Museum and current chairman of the Cataloging Advisory Committee, ARLIS/NA;
Mary Lou Miller, assistant to the principal subject cataloger, Library of Congress

IR010 194

SUBJECT HEADINGS FOR INDIVIDUAL WORKS OF ART,
ARCHITECTURE AND ANALOGOUS ARTIFACTS AND STRUCTURES

INTRODUCTION

In October 1978 Doris Clack, Chairperson of the Subject Analysis Committee (SAC), American Library Association Resources and Technical Services Division, appointed the Subcommittee on Subject Headings for Individual Works of Art, Architecture and Analogous Artifacts and Structures. SAC charged the subcommittee "to identify problem areas and develop principles in accordance with basic subject headings and name entry theory and practice."

Prior to this, two other organizations had done extensive research. From 1975 through 1977 the Art and Architecture Task Force of the Research Libraries Group, Inc. (RLG) studied the issue and reported its findings in Reports no. 3, 10 and 11. In January 1977 the Art Libraries Society of North America (ARLIS/NA) Executive Board asked its Cataloging Advisory Committee (CAC) to study the problems of naming works of art. The committee surveyed the ARLIS/NA membership, consulted the RLG Art and Architecture Task Force reports on this subject, and by June 1978 had prepared a position paper for publication in the ARLIS/NA Newsletter and dissemination to interested groups.

The position paper stated three objections to current Library of Congress (LC) practices as described in Library of Congress Subject Headings (LCSH), pp. ix-x, for Art works (movable art) and Art works (permanently located art): (1) the need to determine entry format for art works according to whether the art work is movable or permanently located; (2) the lack of a subject heading for the artist when the art work is permanently located;

and (3) the use of the form of heading [artist. name of work] for movable art works. The CAC made four recommendations: (1) abandon the distinction between movable and permanently located in establishing the entry; (2) make a subject heading for the artist, when known, for all art works including monuments and buildings; (3) use a subdivision such as "--Individual works" between the name of the artist and name of art work, if used; and (4) provide for a multi-faceted approach through multiple subject headings rather than "see also" references.

ARLIS/NA sent the recommendations to SAC and provided the impetus for SAC to set up the subcommittee for further work. We perceived our task as one of building on their previous work and so began by reviewing critically all of the ARLIS/NA and RLG Task Force on Art and Architecture documentation.

Our discussion began with the first ARLIS/NA recommendation. The responses to the ARLIS/NA CAC questionnaire on LC subject headings for individual works of art indicated that most librarians rejected making a primary distinction for entry format based on permanence of location, pointing out that virtually any work of art can be moved. When executed, a fresco, stained glass window, sculptural decoration, or monument in a public square may be an integral part of its building or site, but it may subsequently be moved and reinstalled in another place. That the London bridge is now in Arizona confirms that permanence is relative.

Report no. 3 by the RLG Art and Architecture Task Force illustrates a further problem: "In cases where the distinction has been applied, for instance altarpieces, the results are confusing to catalog users. Taking as our examples two famous altarpieces by known sculptors of contemporary date, we can illustrate the problem. Our 'Moveable' example can be found

on p. x of LCSH: 'Riemenschneider, Tilman, d. 1531. Windesheim altar of the Twelve Apostles.' The 'Permanent' example is Veit Stoss' Cracow altar which, as it is still to be seen in its church, appears as 'Krakow. Kościoł Mariacki.' This will, presumably, have a 'see also from' Veit Stoss. The point to be made here is that the two altarpieces by virtue of the historical accident of their present locations, are handled quite differently in the catalog. This 'double standard' implies an incredible fore-knowledge of works of art and their destinations before one is able to use the catalog intelligently to look them up." The subcommittee endorsed the ARLIS/NA recommendation to eliminate the movable/permanent distinction as the primary determinant for developing subject access patterns for works of art. However, the fact that many works of art must be studied in situ cannot be ignored and an additional subject heading for the location is later recommended in this report.

It became evident that new patterns would have to provide for the resolution of issues in ways appropriate to the material under discussion. Therefore, in the proposal, we established separate patterns for: I. Art works and analogous artifacts (such as scientific instruments); II. Monuments; III. Buildings, houses, etc.; IV. Gardens; V. Bridges; VI. Parks; and VII. Playgrounds, plazas, streets, and miscellaneous structures. The patterns for all the categories were developed interdependently, in order to provide as much consistency as possible. That is why bridges, for example, follow the pattern for buildings. However, monuments require a separate pattern because they share features with both works of art and buildings and need access points from each pattern. Defined by the Random House Dictionary of the English Language, 1966, as "something erected in memory of a person,

event, etc., as a pillar, statue or the like," a monument has not only an association with the person or event being commemorated, but also a strong association with the place. Monuments frequently carry a popular name and may be situated to intentionally enhance a public area. In addition, the artist is often known.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CHANGE

1. Assign a subject heading for the artist, when known, for all works of art and public monuments, further subdivided by "--Individual works." The most natural approach to art works is through the artist. As quoted earlier, the RLG Task Force report had strongly criticized the practice according to which movable art by a known artist is entered under the artist's name, while permanently located art, e.g., an outdoor mosaic, by the same artist, if still in situ, is entered under its site with only a "see also" reference from the artist's name. All respondents to the ARLIS/NA questionnaire also agreed that all works of fine art should be entered under the artist, when the artist is known.

2. Assign a subject heading for the architect, engineer, landscape architect, or other creator when known, further subdivided by "--Individual works." Reemphasizing the approach stated in the first change, creators of other works interesting for their artistic qualities are also elements in a natural pattern of research. Users who are interested in any works by that architect, for example, or have in mind specific buildings but aren't aware of the names, need access under the architect.

3. Omit the name of the individual art work whether anonymous or by a known artist from the subject heading. This recommendation runs counter to the general policy governing specificity in subject headings and is the

single most controversial issue in the subcommittee's report. It is also, in this regard, not consistent with the heading patterns we propose for the treatment of buildings and public monuments. The subcommittee explored a number of possibilities, but no solutions, including those for the use of various collocating devices, were entirely satisfactory. The paragraphs which follow summarize the various and complicated factors which influenced the subcommittee's decision.

Any close look at the names for the works of art which includes the tracing of various individual works through the literature of art will show that the names for works of art are far softer data than has been imagined to be the case. Very few works have names which can, with confidence, be ascribed to the creator of the work. Most names are conventionalized descriptions of the subject or iconography of the work, or what is interpreted to be the subject or iconography, though there can be wide disagreement on these points. Thus, one of Rembrandt's most admired paintings has appeared in the literature under: "The Birth-day Salutation," "A Man and Wife," "Titus and Magdalena van Loo," "The Jewish Bride," "Isaac and Rebecca," "The Loving Couple" and "Jacob and Rachael." For several generations "The Jewish Bride" has been the "popular name"; however, the tendency of recent scholarship has pointed away from this usage. This is only one aspect of the problem. A work listed as a "Nativity" in one book can appear as a "Holy Family" in another no less reliable source. Even in cases where there would be no disagreement about the name, a Cezanne "Mont Sainte-Victoire," for instance, the name is non-specific because Cezanne painted this motif repeatedly and the name is not able to tell us which picture is under discussion. In an art book the

form of the name is not of absolute importance because it can appear under a reproduction of the work or over other encaptioned information as a way of fixing the referrant for the name. This is a recourse to which a subject heading is not able to avail itself.

Some works have no names at all. They appear in the literature under a generic type of art: e.g., candlestick, bronze door, or altar. In these cases the need to establish a name for the catalog has resulted in constructions which cannot serve as direct access points because they have no meaning outside of the catalog: "Florentiner Skizzenbuch des internationalen Stils" is an instance of this. Mixed into all of this are problems of language. Some names appear consistently in a vernacular: "Les Demoiselles d'Avignon." Others are translated: "Oath of the Horatii." The use of the name "Taufe Christi" for an anonymous Brussels tapestry when that work can be found in standard reference books under "Baptism of Christ" and "Doop van Christus" likewise raises questions about names as access and about the use of vernaculars. And though these examples merely skim the surface of this problem, they should cause one to ask if there is any rule for establishing names in the vernacular, in translation, or in a combination of the two which can satisfy both the need for ease of applicability and the need for cogent access points. It was the sense of the subcommittee that such a rule could not be devised.

On another level, there is a problem in defining what is an individual work of art. Individual panels of a polyptych or single scenes from a fresco cycle may be treated as individual works of art. These are, nevertheless, subordinate parts of works which were conceived as and may also be treated as individual entities.

The present form for entering a work of art under the name of creator is [artist. name of work]. When such an entry is filed into most catalogs, it is interfiled with author/title entries, thus separating items on individual works of an artist from other subject entries under the artist's name. To create a discrete subject file for items which discuss only an individual work of the artist, we suggest assigning the subdivision "--Individual works" under the artist's name instead of a name of the work. This would collocate such items in an artist's subject file while avoiding the problems of determining names.

In order to provide access from the name (or names) by which an art work might be known, a "see" reference may be made from the name to "[artist]--Individual works." This reference will normally be made from the name of the work as it appears in the item being cataloged.

Perhaps this sampling - and it is no more than that - of some of the problems with the use of names for individual works of art will explain the subcommittee's departure from cataloging policy. Buildings and public monuments, by virtue of their public character, present fewer problems of this sort, and so our patterns for these will be seen to be more normative. It is our belief that the addition of the collocating subdivision "--Individual works" under the artist's name, the use of a "see" reference from the name of the work of art and the addition of "[topic] in art" or "[medium] (Indirect)" will satisfy the need for specificity.

4. Establish all subject headings for the names of buildings, gardens, monuments, bridges, parks, playgrounds, plazas, and streets according to the second edition of the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules. Presently, there are 3 possibilities: (1) [city. name] for buildings, etc. in cities;

(2) [name, country] for buildings, etc. outside of cities; and (3) [city--bridges--name of bridge] for bridges, etc., in cities. The first form is the form LC Subject Cataloging Division has used to denote buildings, etc., in cities when the entity was not considered capable of authorship. However, when the entity is considered capable of authorship, its name is established by LC Descriptive Cataloging Division. Until 1972, when AACR1 rules 98 and 99 were deleted, these name forms generally coincided. After that, the remaining provisions of AACR1 applied, with the result that name forms established by the Descriptive Cataloging Division were entered directly under the name of the building, garden, etc., thus conflicting with the patterns used by the Subject Cataloging Division. In the spring 1980 issue of Cataloging Services Bulletin, the Subject Cataloging Division announced that it will follow AACR2 and add geographic qualifiers in parentheses to names of structures and buildings when it establishes the name according to no. 2 above. However, it would be advantageous to establish all names in the same form, thus creating consistency in author and subject catalog entries. Although the provisions of AACR2 are intended to be used when establishing name headings for entities (persons or corporate bodies) considered capable of authorship or emanation, we suggest that for uniformity of name entries they also be applied to names of buildings, etc. even though they are not capable of corporate emanation. When the name of the building and the corporate body inhabiting it are the same and it is necessary or desirable to make a distinction between them, add the qualifier "(Building)" to the entry for the building.

While the current pattern for bridges serves quite well, a consistent pattern of establishing subject headings for all buildings and analogous

structures such as bridges would promote easier application of the rules. Also, catalog users would benefit by the use of one pattern. In strictly quantitative terms, since only bridges, parks, playgrounds, plazas, and streets are set up in that form, it is more economical to change those headings.

5. Use multiple access points. Assign subject headings, rather than "see also" (subject-to-name) references, for the art form or medium of art works and monuments; the subject of art works, if applicable; the location of art works and monuments when studied in situ; and the city subdivided by a topical subdivision for buildings, gardens, and bridges, etc., when possible. This represents a practical change in the recording of the subject analysis. LC establishes "see also" (subject-to-name) references which other libraries do not use. Although recognized as a local decision, the fact that most libraries use subject headings but do not also use the "see also" references, suggests that subject headings are the most useful way for libraries to display cataloging information. Also, since we propose subject headings for the artist without the name of the work, the subject-to-name references are not possible. In order not to lose the access these references provided, subject headings are added. For works of painting and sculpture by known artists it seems necessary to assign subject headings only for special art forms such as mural painting and decoration or mobiles (sculpture). However, it does become necessary to provide subject access under any art form when the artist is not known. The subdivision "Anonymous works" is considered necessary because without it the files under the headings "Painting" or "Sculpture" would be confusingly incomplete in that they would comprehend individual works of

painting and sculpture only when anonymous. This problem does not arise with other art forms (or special types of painting and sculpture), since an added subject heading for art form or medium is to be made in every case, whether the artist is known or not.

The importance of access under city is well established for local history and structures located in cities. Since we propose that the name of the structure be in AACR2 form and not necessarily under city, in order to assure access under city a subject heading is added.

With respect to buildings (and other structures), the subcommittee's original preference was to have dual access to individual buildings by using both the direct name entry and an additional subject heading for [city--building type--name of building], e.g., "1. Saint Patrick's Cathedral (New York, N.Y.) 2. New York (N.Y.)--Churches--Saint Patrick's Cathedral." The addition of the name in the second subdivision was unacceptable to LC, however, and this proposal was reluctantly abandoned. The subcommittee nevertheless continues to believe that this is desirable as a local option for any library wishing to have a more precise file under [city--building type]. Another line of thinking which was explored involved making an explicit distinction between the physical building and the corporate body associated with it, and retaining entry under [city--building type--name] for the building qua building. This idea was abandoned because it does not seem practical to attempt to separate the corporate body from the building in the case of churches and certain other types. Also, it was agreed that names of buildings should preferably be established in conformity with AACR2 principles, even when not capable of authorship. However, it does seem desirable to have the name entry include the qualifying term

such as "(Building)" or "(Castle)," whenever appropriate, for precision in identifying and cross-referencing material on particular buildings as buildings.

It is envisaged that the added subject entry under [city--building type] will be used for works about buildings as such, whether from the architectural, historical or descriptive point of view, but not for works dealing only with a corporate body's organization or activity. The subcommittee considered the idea of devising new subdivisions such as "Museum buildings" or "Museums--Individual buildings" to clarify this, but decided that this was not necessary. For buildings outside of cities, the access through [building type--place] is in the form of a see also reference rather than an additional subject heading. The file under the subject heading would otherwise be incomplete, since it would include single instances of non-urban buildings but not of urban buildings. Problems of this type are largely the consequence of the LC subject heading structure for building types, which allows for either [building type] (Indirect-except cities) or [city--building type], but not both at the same time. This is a practice which the subcommittee deplores, but considered that it would be outside its scope to undertake a thorough review of this problematic area.

The pattern for monuments reflects the fact that they may share characteristics of both art and architecture. An added subject heading for art form or medium is made, subject to the same guidelines applying to works of art. "See also" references, rather than subject headings, are made from headings such as "Monuments," "Statues," and "Fountains" which also occur as subdivisions under cities, for reasons which are explained earlier in the comments on buildings (p. 10-11).

In order to put the new proposal into a frame of reference, compare it to the patterns in LC Subject Headings on pp. ix-xi, for Art works (Movable art); Art works (Permanently located art); Buildings, houses, etc. (in cities); Buildings, houses, etc. (outside of cities); Bridges (in cities); Bridges (outside of cities); Gardens (in cities); and Gardens (outside of cities). In the examples, all name headings have been established according to our present understanding of AACR2.

PATTERNS AND EXAMPLES OF SUBJECT HEADINGS

I. ART WORKS AND ANALOGOUS ARTIFACTS (SUCH AS SCIENTIFIC INSTRUMENTS)

A. Pattern

1. [name of artist]--Individual works (if known)

x Name(s) of art work

2. [art form or medium] (Indirect) (except headings beginning with the words Painting and Sculpture)

or 2. [medium] (Indirect)--Anonymous works (for anonymous works of painting and sculpture only)

3. [name of building or site] (if attached to or strongly associated with building or site)

4. [subject of work] (if applicable)

B. Examples. For art works only, titles of books being cataloged are included because the name of the art work is not in the subject heading.

Example 1: Kuhn, R. Michelangelo: die Sixtinische Decke. Berlin, 1975.

Michelangelo Buonarroti, 1475-1564--Individual works.

x Sixtinische Decke

Mural painting and decoration, Renaissance--Vatican City.

Cappella sistina (Vatican City)

Example 2: Seymour, Charles. Michelangelo's David. Pittsburgh, 1967.

Michelangelo Buonarroti, 1475-1564--Individual works.

x David (Sculpture)

David, King of Israel--Art.

Example 3: Simon, Erika. Die Portlandvase. Mainz, 1957.

Vases, Roman.

Cameo glass.

Example 4: Bieber, Margarete. Laocoon, the influence of the group since its rediscovery. New York, 1942.

Sculpture, Greek--Anonymous works.

Serpents in art.

Laocoon--Art.

Example 5: Sutherland, G. V. The Coventry tapestry. Greenwich, Conn., 1964.

Sutherland, Graham Vivian, 1903- --Individual works.

x Coventry tapestry

Tapestry--England--Coventry.

Coventry Cathedral.

Example 6: Weindel, P. Das Bronzetor des Speyerer Domes. Speyer, 1974.

Bronze doors--Germany (West)--Speyer.

Speyer Dom.

II. MONUMENTS

A. Pattern

1. [name of artist]--Individual works (if known)

2. [name of work] (if named)

x [alternate form(s) of name]

xx [type of monument--country]

[name of person, event, place commemorated--Monuments, etc.]

3. [city--topical subdivision for type of monument] (if in a city)

4. [art form or medium] (Indirect) (except headings beginning with the words Painting or Sculpture)

or 4. [art form or medium] (Indirect)--Anonymous works (for anonymous works of painting and sculpture only)

B. Examples

Example 1:

Borglum, Gutzon--Individual works.

Mount Rushmore National Memorial (S.D.)

xx Monuments--South Dakota

Presidents--United States--Monuments, etc.

Portrait sculpture--South Dakota.

Example 2:

Mills, Robert, 1781-1855--Individual works.

Washington Monument (Washington, D.C.)

xx Obelisks--Washington (D.C.)

Washington, George, 1732-1799--Monuments, etc.

Washington (D.C.)--Monuments.

Example 3:

Picasso, Pablo, 1881-1973--Individual works.

Bather (Sculpture)

x Baigneur (Sculpture)

xx Statues--Illinois

Rolling Meadows (Ill.)--Statues.

Example 4: Headings for: a statue of George Washington standing in Foley Square, New York City, by J. Q. A. Ward.

Ward, J. Q. A. (John Quincy Adams)--Individual works.

New York (N.Y.)--Statues.

III. BUILDINGS, HOUSES, ETC.

A. Pattern

1. [name of structure]

x [alternate name(s) of structure]

xx [type of structure--country]

[name of famous owner]--Homes (if appropriate)

Architecture, Domestic--[country] (make for houses)

2. [name of architect]--Individual works (if known)

3. [city--topical subdivision for building type] (if in a city)

B. Examples

Example 1:

Schloss Bruck (Lienz, Austria)

x Bruck Castle (Lienz, Austria)

xx Castles--Austria

Lienz (Austria)--Castles.

Example 2:

Bradbury Building (Los Angeles, Calif.)

xx Mercantile buildings--California

Office buildings--California

Wyman, George H.--Individual works.

Los Angeles (Calif.)--Office buildings.

Example 3:

Carll Tucker III House (N.Y.)

x Tucker House (N.Y.)

xx Architecture, Domestic--New York (State)

Dwellings--New York (State)

Venturi & Rauch (Firm)--Individual works.

Example 4:

Compton Wynyates (Warwickshire)

xx Architecture, Domestic--England

Dwellings--England

Manors--England

Example 5:

Glessner House (Chicago, Ill.)

x John J. Glessner House (Chicago, Ill.)

xx Dwellings--Illinois

Architecture, Domestic--Illinois

Richardson, H. H. (Henry Hobson), 1838-1886--Individual works.

Chicago (Ill.)--Dwellings.

IV. GARDENS

A. Pattern

1. [name of garden]

x [alternate name(s) of garden]

xx Gardens--[country]

[Special location, if appropriate]

2. [name of landscape architect]--Individual works (if known)

3. [city]--Gardens (if within a city)

B. Examples

Example 1:

Jardin du Luxembourg (Paris, France)

x Luxembourg Garden (Paris, France)

xx Gardens--France

Palais du Luxembourg (Paris, France)

Paris (France)--Gardens.

Example 2:

Stowe House (Buckinghamshire). Gardens.

xx Gardens--England

Gardens, English--England

Kent, William, 1685-1758--Individual works.

V. BRIDGES

A. Pattern

1. [name of bridge]

x [alternate name(s) of bridge]

xx [type of bridge]

[river or water body]--Bridges

Bridges--[country]

2. [name of engineer]--Individual works (if known)

3. [city]--Bridges (if within a city)

B. Examples

Example 1:

Brooklyn Bridge (New York, N.Y.)

x New York and Brooklyn Bridge (New York, N.Y.)

xx Bridges, Suspension

East River (N.Y.)--Bridges

Bridges--New York (State)

Roebling, John (John Augustus), 1806-1869--Individual works.

New York (N.Y.)--Bridges.

VI. PARKS

A. Pattern

1. [name of park]

x [alternate name(s) of park]

xx National parks and reserves--[country, without exception]
(if a national park)

Parks--[country]

[name of larger system] (if applicable)

2. [name of landscape architect]--Individual works (if known)

3. [city]--Parks (if within a city)

B. Examples

Example 1:

Syon Park (London, England)

xx Parks--England

Brown, Capability--Individual works.

London (England)--Parks.

Example 2:

Valley Forge National Historical Park (Pa.)

x Valley Forge State Park (Pa.)

xx Historic sites--Pennsylvania

National parks and reserves--United States

Parks--Pennsylvania

VII. PLAYGROUNDS, PLAZAS, STREETS AND MISCELLANEOUS STRUCTURES

A. Pattern

1. [name of playground, plaza, or street, etc.]

x [alternate name(s) of playground, etc.]

xx Playgrounds, [etc.]--[country]

2. [name of landscape architect, etc.]--Individual works (if known)

3. [city--topical subdivision for type of structure]

B. Examples

Example 1:

Canton Playground (Baltimore, Md.)

xx Playgrounds--Maryland

Baltimore (Md.)--Playgrounds.

Example 2:

Grand Place (Brussels, Belgium)

xx Plazas--Belgium

Brussels (Belgium)--Plazas.

Example 3:

Avenue of the Americas (New York, N.Y.)

x Sixth Avenue (New York, N.Y.)

xx Streets--New York (State)

New York (N.Y.)--Streets.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

As catalogers and catalog users, we recognize the considerable impact that changing LC subject headings is likely to have on the catalog. An extensive and critical discussion of the problems and the inherent difficulties of any solutions has preceded our recommendations.

The first draft of this proposal appeared in the RTSD Newsletter (Nov./Dec. 1980). The second draft appeared in the ARLIS/NA Newsletter (Nov./Dec. 1980) and was also presented to the ALA RTSD Cataloging and Classification Section Subject Analysis Committee on Feb. 1, 1981 (ALA Midwinter meetings). Pending addition of the provision for "see" references from names of individual works to the heading for "Artist--Individual works," the proposal was endorsed by the committee.

The final proposal is the product of the subcommittee: Donald Anderle, chief, Art and Architecture Division, New York Public Library; Peter Lisbon, chief subject cataloger, Widener Library, Harvard University; Karen Muller, head, Technical Services, Ryerson and Burnham Libraries, the Art Institute of Chicago; Al Cohen, head, Cataloging Dept., University of California, Santa Barbara; and the chairperson, Jennifer Younger, principal cataloger, Memorial Library, University of Wisconsin-Madison. We must also mention the work of Bethany Mendenhall, associate librarian, J. Paul Getty Museum and current chairman of the Cataloging Advisory Committee, ARLIS/NA and Mary Lou Miller, assistant to the principal subject cataloger, Library of Congress.